DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 876 SO 024 045

AUTHOR Bjerstedt, Ake
TITLE The Meaning of "Peace Education": Associations, Emphases, and Sub-categories. Peace Education Reports No. 9.
INSTITUTION Lund Univ., Malmo (Sweden). Dept. of Educational and Psychological Research.
REPORT NO ISSN-1101-6426
PUB DATE Feb 94
NOTE 54p.
AVAILABLE FROM R & D Group, Preparedness for Peace. School of Education, Box 23501, S-200, 45 Malmo, Sweden.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Association Measures; Discussion; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Interviews; *Opinions; *Peace; Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

Included in an interview with 50 experts who have a special interest in peace education and represent 22 countries, this report documents and discusses answers to the question: "What do you think of first when you hear the words 'peace education'?" Part 1 of the report presents a summary of some of the major aspects of the answers related to the meaning of the term peace education. Part 2 gives a more detailed documentation of the interview answers regarding the question. The reactions vary and testify to the fact that peace education is a changeable field in an early stage of development. The responses show a strong tendency to take up a discussion of possible sub-categories within the field using more specific labels. (CK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE MEANING OF "PEACE EDUCATION": ASSOCIATIONS, EMPHASES, AND SUB-CATEGORIES

Åke Bjerstedt

The present report documents and discusses answers to the question: "What do you think of first when you hear the words 'peace education'?" This question was included in an interview with fifty experts (representing twenty-two countries) with a special interest in peace education. The reactions were quite varied, and testified to the fact that peace education is still a changeable field in an early stage of development. There was a strong tendency among the respondents, however, to see peace education as quite a broad area and to take up a discussion of possible sub-categories within that field, using some more specific labels.

Keywords: Aims of education, citizenship education, concept analysis, conflicts, cooperation, global approach, interviews, learning process, non-violence, peace education.

PART I

The present report documents and discusses answers to the question: "What do you think of first when you hear the words 'peace education'?" This question was included in an interview with fifty experts (representing twenty-two countries) with a special interest in peace education.

Part I of the report presents my attempts to summarize some major aspects of the answers, related to the meaning of the term peace education, while Part II gives a more detailed documentation of the interview answers in this area. – More information about the fifty experts is available in a separate report (Bjerstedt, 1993).

The phrasing of the question was deliberately made quite wide – in a way that sometimes surprised the interviewees and elicited an initial smile or laughter. We did not ask for any strict definition (although many interviewees chose to discuss definitions and delimitations), but for more general associations and reactions. In this way, the range of answers covered both denotations and connotations, both intellectual analysis and attitudinal reactions.

Being experts in the fields, more than one of the respondents experienced some difficulty in responding, just because the question dealt with something they had often worked with in considerable detail. Robert Aspeslagh, for example – one of the former executive secretaries of the Peace Education Commission – said: "I have difficulties in answering that question, because I know so many definitions. I need a lot of time to think about it..."

Some negative or hesitant reactions to the term

We know that "peace education" is still somewhat of a "problem term", at least for some groups in some countries. In this case, however, we deal with a group of interviewees who could normally be considered positively disposed to the idea of peace education and even often identify themselves as "peace educators". Nevertheless, we encountered a number of reactions to the term "peace education" that were more or less negative or hesitant. Let me give some examples.

"I am not particularly fond of the phrase 'peace education' and never have been. I don't use it very much. First it's a rather vague expression. Second, many people in this country associate it with appeasement or pacifism or leftism. We have usually avoided this expression within ESR /Educators for Social Responsibility/." (Susan Alexander.)

"I find the term itself evokes stereotypes in people's mind – as if there were some special course you could take. I prefer the term 'peace learning' to 'peace education'. This shifts the emphasis to what goes on inside the learner rather than on something out there. (If you teach it right, people will understand what peace is and what they have to do.) So I have some resistance to the term itself." (Elise Boulding.)

"I have mixed feelings, frankly. There is a lot that goes under that broad title that I think is not well thought through and has a kind of general tender-heartedness and soft-mindedness. On the other hand, I think the values behind it are important and should be supported, and I think that there are essential educational efforts in that area that should be strengthened." (Morton Deutsch.)

"But education is a word that I do not like very much in this connection. What we deal with is the formation or development of character. Of course, there is important information about arms; but it is more important to help people not to be afraid, to overcome fear, and to have the courage to do the things they think are right." (Alberto L'Abate.)

"We called what we did in ESR in those early years 'nuclear age education', not 'peace education'. People thought that the word peace was too much associated with communism, that the word had been in a sense corrupted and that we represented a new mind, and so we needed a new label, and that was the term 'nuclear age education'. ... I think this educational effort first became concrete and real for me when we started the program with the public schools in New York. ... For a couple of years, we called the program 'The Model Peace Education Program', and then, as we expanded the program beyond that district into other districts, we found that the term peace education was getting in our way – it was raising questions in people that were distracting – and so we decided to change the name to 'The Resolving Conflict Creatively Program'..." (Tom Roderick.)

"I suppose my reaction to the term now is less positive than it was ten years ago. One of the reasons why it's less positive than it was is that I think that the task is more to learn about peace that to educate. The problem with the world educate for me is that it has a connotation that we know and therefore we can transmit. I think that we don't know enough, and that most of what we can transmit is questions. We need to know more and research more. So for me the idea of collective learning about peace is a better phrase than peace education. But I do teach peace studies, so you might find some contradition there." (Nigel Young.)

Obviously, in some cases the term "peace education" has been some sort

of "communication barrier"; and both parts of the expression may apparently contribute to this. The emphasis on "peace" may evoke "undesirable" associations of "softmindedness", "appeasement" and "leftism" among people with certain preconceptions in this area; and the emphasis on "education" may evoke stereotypes that we have some simple knowledge to transmit. When noting such a "communication barrier", there may be two ways out: (1) avoiding the term; or (2) explaining the basic idea better, developing new and more adequate connotations to the term. In this area, different people have chosen different strategies. In some of the quotations above, we find avoidance reactions. On the other hand, during recent years the term "peace education" seems to have gained a wider acceptance. For most of our interviewees, the expression does not seem to involve any major problem.

Nevertheless, it is useful to know the potential problems indicated in order to be ready to deal with concerns evoked – handling misunderstandings in dialogue with parents and teachers, for example.

Broad vs. narrow interpretation; education about peace vs. education for peace; explicit vs. implicit peace education

A majority of our respondents interpret peace education as quite a broad field. In a few cases, the meaning referred to is so broad that it seems almost identical with "good education". Some such formulations may be quoted:

"The first thing I think of is good education: that peace education implies a commitment not only to a certain educational content but to a pedagogy as well that gives teachers and students alike an opportunity to practice some of the skills and some of the values that peace education is concerned about transmitting." (Robin Burns.)

"My own concept of peace education is constantly evolving and growing. Right now what comes to my mind is quality education, the kind of education that we need in order to have an enhancement of life, so that we can all live together peacefully and joyfully on this planet. Peace education has to be concerned about full equality and mutuality, and this has to be part of the content and methodology. It has to be concerned about having as full participation as possible. Constitutive to justice is that each of us has the right to participate in decisions which affect our lives. It has to be concerned about human rights, both economic and political; it has to be concerned about economic justice. It needs to deal with environmental viability, concern for creation. Dealing creatively with conflict or non-

violently with conflict is also an important element. Conflict has always been a part of life, but the task is to see it as something that can be dealt with non-violently. So I see all of those areas as components constitutive to peace education." (Kathleen Kanet.)

"I think that peace education is, in essence, good education. I think that peace has to be analyzed just as Galtung did – into 'positive peace' and 'negative peace' – and I think education is primarily in favour of something and not against something. I define peace education as the kind of education which introduces children into the world in a way that is adjusted to their situation and their possibilities and confronts them with their future responsibilities for preservation of life in this world, inviting them to accept possibilities and adapt them to their own situation." (Lennart Vriens.)

In part of the peace education movement, we can see a development from a more narrow view to a broader and more holistic view of peace education during recent decades. This development is pointed out by Toh Swee-Hin, for example: "I must confess that initially, especially in the seventies in the Western countries, peace education was very much connected with the 'disarmament movement'..., and I had that idea as well. However, as I began to collaborate with Australian peace educators, people like Jen Burnley and Robin Burns for example, I shared their view that peace education should not be restricted to disarmament issues. I think that in Australia, over the last ten years, we have been able to establish a consensus about this. It is very rare nowadays, when people in Australia hear about peace education, that they would think that it is just about disarmament. Among teachers the holistic concept is very much the idea now."

Obviously this broadening of the concept is not without problems; there may be a risk of vagueness and unclarity. One of the counter-measures is to discuss various kinds of subdivisions of the broad field of peace education, giving lists of specific objectives to be aimed for, or at least distinguishing some different approaches within the area.

When indicating such major approaches, you may for example make a distinction between *education about peace* and *education for peace*. (Sometimes this distinction is phrased in terms of "education for peace" vs. "peace education".) Let us give some examples.

"To me, peace education implies both education *about* peace and education *for* peace. Education for peace is a broad subject, connected to democracy in school and the attempts to create an open and cooperative classroom atmosphere, among other things. It is quite natural for an educator to include such things. But if one approaches this subject from the point of

view of political science, for example, or if one is a peace researcher of a more traditional kind, the tendency is rather to regard peace education as instruction *about* peace and war, and one is very often of the opinion that the primary objective is to disseminate the results of peace research." (Birgit Brock-Utne.)

"'Peace education' tends to be education about war and peace. I prefer 'education *for* peace'; I think this is a much broader term: an education preparing students to grow up in a secure and peaceful future. Environmental education, international understanding, non-violent conflict resolution, both at the local and the global level, would all be part of 'education *for* peace'." (Terry Carson.)

"In England, many people think differently about 'peace education' and 'education for peace'. People who talk about 'peace education' generally are talking about conveying a better understanding of theories, of information, of facts about problems of peace and war. It is an intellectual type of approach to the topic, which is one that for the most part we have to adopt in universities and we do adopt in the university. – However, many people speak about 'education for peace' and they think about having people in school get used to peace as a natural living experience in the classroom, focusing on the educational process, the pedagogical principles involved. My own personal bias is towards that approach, and in a perfect world that is the approach I would like to take." (Paul Smoker.)

Related to this distinction between "education about peace" and "education for peace" is the distinction between *"explicit peace education"* (or "education as text") and *"implicit peace education"* (or "education as context") made in some replies as follows:

"I conceive peace education in the first place as ... education in global conflicts and problems, aimed at awareness and knowledge of and insight into these conflicts and problems, and the need for and possibility of political change. Peace education is conceived especially as problem-oriented political education, with the emphasis on transferring knowledge of and insights into the backgrounds, causes and characters of the global conflicts and problems which threaten peace, as well as on possibilities and proposals for peaceful conflict regulation and resolution, and for limiting and solving problems. As a consequence, the emphasis should be on the development of teaching materials and curricula, based on theories, knowledge and insights from conflict and peace research and related scientific disciplines. In the Netherlands we call this approach 'direct' or 'explicit' peace education. – There is another approach which we call

'indirect' or 'implicit' peace education. It is characteristic for that approach that peace education is conceived especially as teaching values related to peace. ... The emphasis is on moral education, with peace as a central value. Education should promote peace in thought, attitudes and conduct." (Henk B. Gerritsma.)

"To me, the most important results of peace education in the schools are the pupils' attitudes and expectations, that which is sometimes called second-order learning. Certain factual knowledge and skills are central to a learning situation; they are the immediate content or 'the text'. 'The context' is those habits, attitudes and expectations that develop gradually as a consequence of the text and the atmosphere you work in. I don't want to call something peace education proper as long as it's just a matter of 'text' (learning simple facts about war and peace), but only when the 'context' is included." (Eva Nordland.)

When dealing with distinctions in terms of "education about peace" vs. "education for peace" or in terms of "explicit peace education" vs. "implicit peace education", you may state your preference. You may prefer the first mentioned alternatives *or* the second alternatives *or* you may feel that it is essential to use a combination of both. Different interviewees have different preferences. However, there seems to be some consensus now in the peace education field (and then I talk not only of the interviews documented here, but about the views expressed in the recent literature) that both approaches are relevant and usually should be combined. It is also obvious, however, that the emphasis may be different in different educational settings. For example, the implicit or context approach will be natural when dealing with young children, whereas the explicit or text approach could play an increasing role when dealing with older students.

Alternative terms in Scandinavia

Most of the interviews with this expert group were carried out in English, but this was not the case with people having Danish, Norwegian and Swedish as their mother tongue. For example, in an interview between the author of this report and a Norwegian interviewee, it would be natural to ask questions in Swedish and have the answers in Norwegian. (Therefore, such interviews were later translated into English for an international audience.)

When having Danish, Norwegian and Swedish respondents, the interview question under discussion in this report was formulated slightly differently, due to the fact that there is no simple term in these Scandinavian languages

which is immediately experienced to have the same broad meaning as the English term "peace education". In Swedish, the question was phrased: "Vad tänker du i första hand på, när du hör uttrycken 'fredsfostran' och 'fredsundervisning'?" ("What do you think of first when you hear the expressions 'fredsfostran' and 'fredsundervisning'?") "Fredsfostran" and "fredsundervisning" can both be translated by "peace education", but for most Scandinavians they have different connotations, approximately indicated by "rearing/training for peace" and "peace-related instruction".

Using these two expressions with some of our interviewees led to some discussion about these two alternative terms, perhaps indicating a preference for one or the other, and sometimes referring to the discussion related to these two alternatives that had taken place in the Scandinavian countries. In Sweden, for example, the National Board of Education started work in this area using the term "fredsfostran" (as recommended by the Swedish educator Anatol Pikas), but then changed to the term "fredsundervisning" after having experienced some critical newspaper debate on the topic. Here are a few examples from the present set of interviews, related to this special discussion of alternative Scandinavian terms.

Birgit Brock-Utne (Norway) did not discuss this particular distinction in her first spontaneous reply to the question, but was prompted to do so by a follow-up question. "ÅB: There have been some discussions in Sweden about the term 'fredsfostran' vis-à-vis the term 'fredsundervisning'. Has that also been discussed in Norway? – BB: Yes, to some extent. We encounter a difficulty in our languages which doesn't exist in English, where 'education' covers both concepts. In English, on the other hand, a distinction is customarily made between 'education *for* peace' which I would translate as 'fredsfostran' and 'education *about* peace'. This type of peace education primarily involves cognition, and is usually taken up in the upper grades in school, whereas 'fredsfostran' or education *for* peace is something that, in principle, is begun at birth. – ÅB: With regard to the input of the school, in Norway you usually talk mainly about 'fredsundervisning'. Is that true even when you think about the school's non-cognitive input? – BB: We are not particularly consistent in our use of terminology, but we tend to use the word 'fredsundervisning' when we are dealing with the formal institution called 'school'. Now that I have myself written about feminist perspectives on 'peace education', I have distinguished between 'peace education in the non-formal sector' (meaning upbringing, and influences from home, parents and peer groups, as well as from the leisure environment, e.g. sports, the media, and toys) and 'peace education in the

formal sector' (meaning what the schools have to offer). In my book I make a distinction between the formal curriculum of the school where one may talk about education *about* peace and the hidden curriculum where you find more of what I would call education *for* peace or, often, for oppression."

Magnus Haavelsrud (Norway): "I think I prefer 'fredsundervisning', and by that I refer to people's understanding of the world we live in, among other things. Consciousness-raising may be a keyword. ... – ÅB: You said that you prefer the term 'fredsundervisning'. Do you also use the expression 'fredsfostran' or 'fredsoppdragelse'? – MH: No, I think 'freds-undervisning' is the most important thing. To me, the term 'fostran' implies that there's a need for change. I don't have the impression that children experience the need for becoming something different from what they are as far as issues of peace are concerned. Nor do I have the urge to change children. The fact that children become bellicose – I think that's a question of preventing things from happening to children rather than changing the children. So I don't think changing people is the main point."

Stig Lindholm (Sweden): "As far as 'fredsfostran' ('rearing/training for peace') is concerned, I have been a bit allergic to that term, and I think that is due to what generation you belong to. In actual fact, it should be a good thing, because as far as I can understand, 'fostran' ('training') has to do with ethics and values. On the one hand, then, I have renounced that term, but on the other hand I have begun to consider whether it might be re-introduced in one way or another. But 'fostran' ('training') sounds so authoritarian. The best thing would be if a new term could be found. If you go outside the school situation, can you talk about 'fostran' ('training') of your fellow human beings in this area? I am not at all sure about that."

Eva Nordland (Norway): "To me, the term 'fredsfostran' ('rearing/training for peace') is more oriented towards a wider peace pedagogy input, where the 'context' plays a certain role, whereas the term 'freds-undervisning' ('peace-related instruction') in its traditional sense is more oriented towards what I call 'text'. But words change their meaning as you use them, and therefore I don't want to argue too much about terminology. But I am not so keen on talking about 'fostran' ('rearing/training') unless the atmosphere has also been included. You can give peace education in an authoritarian atmosphere, and you can give it in an atmosphere where the element of competition takes priority; but under those circumstances it's not 'fostran' ('rearing/training') in my sense of the word. But, as I already said, it all depends on how you choose to define your terms, so definitions are

more important than the words themselves."

More examples of views on this particular Scandinavian term issue can be found elsewhere (see Ankarstrand-Lindström & Bjerstedt, 1988).

From these various discussions, four kinds of arguments may be mentioned here. One deals with the *breadth of the educational goal area*. The respondents then indicate that the term "fredsundervisning" ("peace-oriented instruction") tends to lead us to think about a relatively narrow goal area (knowledge, cognitions), whereas "fredsfostran" ("rearing/training for peace") covers a broader spectrum of influences where attitudes, values and behavioral tendencies are also included. If one considers this broader kind of influence natural and important in dealing with the area of peace and war, this view may also be an argument in favor of the term "fredsfostran".

Another type of argument deals with more *special associations* or connotations related to the term "fostran" ("rearing/training"). The term seems to connote an authoritarian view, an attitude "from above". This may then be an argument against the term "fredsfostran".

The third type of reasoning has a more *tactical* character. One might be eager to have the schools work constructively with the issues related to peace and war, but one finds that the term "fredsfostran" – for various reasons – evokes resistance among some people, that it functions as a communication barrier. Hence, one wants to choose a term that seems to be more easily accepted. This was apparently the major reason for the change of terms in the official texts of the Swedish National Board of Education in the middle of the 1980s.

If, on the one hand, one finds that the term "fredsundervisning" ("peace-related instruction") leads one's thoughts towards too narrow a goal area; and if, on the other hand, one feels that the term "fredsfostran" gives connotations related to authoritarian attitudes; one might also find that *none of the terms is quite adequate*. So in our interview groups we also find those who express the need of some new term. Perhaps we should have a prize competition about a better term, says Peter Wallensteen (Ankarstrand-Lindström & Bjerstedt, 1988, p. 158).

Knowledge and reflection

Knowledge is obviously important in any kind of peace education, and different illustrations of knowledge to be dealt with are given by the interviewees. An example follows:

"... we have to have a much better teaching of geography and history.

Very few children in the United States have an adequate understanding of the world's geography, and they have very little understanding of history from the perspective of other cultures. For example, I find reading Islamic texts or world history is very rewarding in letting you see the world in a different way. Reading Chinese world history texts works in a similar way. ... I also put a lot of emphasis on understanding the complexity of interstate relationships. In the United States ... we don't understand the 2,000 different intergovernment organizations that do the work of the interstate system around the world. Even less understood and more important in the long run are the 18,000 nongovernmental organizations, which have come into being in this century. ... In the United States, I have tried to use Unesco published books instead of the textbooks published in the U.S., so that students will understand the new international economic order, the new international cultural order, and the new international information order. These things are not reflected in stuff that's published in the U.S., so students don't get a proper chance to understand the present information order and the present culture. All of this to my mind is peace education." (Elise Boulding.)

In this case, one emphasis is upon adding *knowledge that transcends the too ethnocentric perspective* and facilitates the development of more adequate *global perspectives*.

In general, knowledge as "facts" is not heavily emphasized in the answers. Rather, the interviewees stress the importance of *reflection, reaching insights* by processing information. Some illustrative formulations:

"I think ... of the ability to make a critique of the present social order and some of its structures – from the national to the global arena – that I think are anti-peace. Children and adults need the ability to analyze the situation they are in, to reflect on that and to attempt to put some of their insights into practice as a basis for new reflections." (Robin Burns.)

"Consciousness-raising may be a keyword. I'm influenced by Freire's concept of dialogue and understanding, so it's important for me to speak about both content and form and the context in which it takes place. Consequently I want to talk about a content that has not been defined in advance but that is defined by means of a dialogue among the participants. In other words, I attach great importance to the fact that the participants themselves should be involved and establish the premises for the choice of subject-matter, as well as to the fact that the subject-matter is gradually changed by means of dialogue. In this way, the experiences of the individual are ex-

panded, and we can witness a gradual insight into larger areas as well as an awareness of new connections." (Magnus Haavelsrud.)

"ESR /Educators for Social Responsibility/ developed an approach to teaching about controversial issues that was based on the idea of dialogue, of presenting students with multiple points of view on issues and teaching critical thinking skills and helping them make up their own minds. We certainly wanted young people to decide that there were alternatives to the arms race, but the leadership of ESR tried to be scrupulously fair in presenting opposing points of view to students and encouraging them to make up their own minds. As educators we felt it wasn't appropriate to use the schools to promote one particular solution ... We wanted to put the issue of the nuclear arms race on the agenda of the schools, and on the agenda of the society, for people to talk about and think about and decide about in a democratic fasion. Our feeling was that it had been left up to the so-called experts, that the public had not been involved. Suddenly, in the 80s, we found ourselves in a situation where the end of the world literally was a possibility, where scientists could no longer assure us that if there was a nuclear war, human life would go on. So we were part of the movement saying: Stop, look what's happening. Many people were simply saying: Stop this madness! We were saying: Stop and think, and let's devote all of our energies to looking at this critically, examining various alternatives and choosing the best one." (Tom Roderick.)

Values and readiness for action

Peace education does not only involve cognitive aspects (knowledge and insights), however. *Value perspectives* are also important, although a few respondents seem extra careful when describing how the school should deal with values in this connection. Some examples of value-related formulations follow:

"First, we need basic information, we have to have knowledge; otherwise we will not be able to think rationally and make rational decisions. In addition to providing information, peace education should be able to develop the skill of rational thinking, critical thinking. But that is not enough. I think attitudes and values should also be reoriented towards the development of a more peaceful environment and a more peaceful community. ... Peace education should address two questions related to attitudes and values. One is: What are these attitudes and values that we should develop? And the second is: What should we do to be able to translate these attitudes and values into critical action? For me peace education would be

merely an academic exercise if it does not motivate people to commit themselves to social action." (Virginia Floresca-Cawagas.)

Virginia Floresca-Cawagas also mentioned her efforts, in the Philippines, to identify relevant "core values", mentioning, among others, social responsibility, respect for human rights, cultural solidarity, and environmental care.

"ÅB: When you think of peace education, do you think of it as mostly a cognitive thing or do you also include attitudes, values and behavior tendencies? – HK: It is a tricky thing, and one has to make certain distinctions. If you talk about peace education in schools, one has to be careful to distinguish it from propaganda or indoctrination which is promoting a particular standpoint. But at the same time I don't see any way in which one can meaningfully contribute to students' thinking about peace without addressing attitudes. ... When you want to direct education towards enhancing a sense of efficacy and enhancing the feeling that the individual has to take some responsibility for public policy, this certainly involves attitudes. I would also argue that these are really extensions of what we mean by education in the first place. What we mean by education is not just to instill a certain set of skills or a certain set of facts – it is also to develop an attitude to the world. In what I see as liberal education, you would like the students to become persons who actively confront the environment. So I think there are certain implicit values in education, and one has to make choices. In that sense I don't feel that we can avoid thinking of the process as both cognitive and attitudinal, value-related." (Herbert C. Kelman.)

"Then, the more mature our boys and girls are, the more we can spell out more detailed aims in three areas: knowledge, values and motivation. – ÅB: When you say values, what values would you especially think about in this context? – BR: I think that peace itself is a value, but it is not enough to describe it in this way. To make peace we need social justice, social care and other things which, taken together, mean peace. We have to develop these values in our students that make them able to create peace in a broad sense. This includes, for example, choosing non-violent ways of solving problems." (Bogdan Rowinski.)

"To me, the basic ideas behind peace education are human rights, equality and justice. People are struggling and striving to acquire human rights all over the world – not only in their personal life – and to save their environment and their life in general. To me peace education means nearly the same thing as humanistic education: to educate people to honour human dignity, human rights and justice." (Riitta Wahlström.)

"ÅB: In this peace education or collective learning about peace, would you include more than facts and cognitive aspects? Do you also consider attitudes and values, for example? – NY: Yes, but I would like that we would mutually reflect on values rather than trying to presume that we would inculcate certain values, so it would be a dialogue about values. I would certainly be open to share my concerns about war, nuclear war, violence and justice, but I would anticipate and accept that other people's priorities may be different." (Nigel Young.)

When we presented opinions on values and attitudes, we also included some formulations related to *"readiness for action"*. Such a readiness is obviously a very important long-term goal for peace education. Some more explicit formulations from our group of interviewees may be quoted:

"Peace education is ... aiming at the creation of responsibility for and contribution to a more livable and human world society, which is non-violent and just." (Robert Aspeslagh.)

"... education for a peaceful future is necessarily action-oriented..." (Terry Carson.)

"In general, this is education to prepare people to change the world in a positive way, and to make them feel that they are able to change it. You feel you can do something, and if you feel this, you are responsible, so the next step is education towards responsibility." (Bogdan Rowinski.)

"... all the academic understanding in the world will not change the world for the better, make it more peaceful, if we do not translate the understanding into action. We need to teach empowerment, the commitment that one has the responsibility to try to change the world, not only as individuals but particularly in collaboration with other people – joining hands with others to effect social action." (Toh Swee-Hin.)

A final note on terminological precision and terminological development

Even though in some respects we find a considerable degree of consensus in the term interpretations and preferences for sub-terms within our group of interviewees, it is also apparent that in other respects we find a certain terminological confusion or instability, and that we are dealing with a field that is in a fairly early stage of development. This situation makes it natural to warn against two opposite and extreme positions or action patterns. One of them is to prematurely, too quickly, make final decisions on the terminology. Alternative expressions and new terminological creations should be accepted and welcome, when the available terminology is not

experienced as quite satisfactory. The other extreme position would be to let the terms of a field such as the present one mean almost anything, or to allow various terms to function as mutually almost totally exchangeable. Here we have to demand from each term user, at least, to make quite clear how he or she uses the term in question.

Anyhow, my hope is that the present documentation of views on the meaning of peace education can function as a starting-point for creative reflections on how we think and talk about educational efforts related to peace and war, and that such reflections will help to lead us – step by step in our future work – to a greater consensus with respect to both terminology and educational procedures.

PART II

Susan Alexander (Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA)

I'm not particularly fond of the phrase "peace education" and never have been. I don't use it very much. First, it's a rather vague expression. Second, many people in this country associate it with appeasement or pacifism or leftism. We have usually avoided this expression within ESR.

Robert Aspeslagh (Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

I have difficulties in answering that question, because I know so many definitions. I need a lot of time to think about it and what to tell you about what peace education is. I don't like to give strict definitions of peace education or talk exlusively about positive peace, negative peace and so on. I always say: A cow is a mammal, but not every mammal is a cow; so peace education is education, but not all education is peace education. You have to find *the* differences yourself. I can say: Every step people take towards peace in relation with others, with children but also with adults, due to educational influence, is peace education. It is a gradual learning process. I don't belong to the group that says: School has a structure of violence so you can't have peace education in this world. I think of peace education as a step-by-step process in education, aiming at a concept or idea of peace that people develop together.

If you would like to have some kind of definition, I would formulate it in the following way. Peace education is

A. the introduction into
   - interpretations, which we acquire through the learning of knowledge and the discovering by experiences;
   - varied forms of life, for which the acquisition of certain abilities, such as being self-supporting, being self-restrained, acting in sympathy with others, are necessary in order to participate in these forms of life;

B. giving direction to this on the basis of clear anthropological, political and social orientation; and

C. aiming at the creation of responsibility for and contribution to a more livable and human world society, which is non-violent and just.

Anima Bose (New Delhi, India)

Three things. When I first heard the word "peace education", it struck me that you cannot teach peace, it has to be learnt as practitioners. That's no. 1. No. 2: Peace education must include a course which we may call "live it" course; an apprenticeship, as it were. If you want to find out what violence is, as a student, you have to go out in the real world and find out what violence is, what your solutions are, how you see peace can be brought about. That is, finding it out experientially. Finally, peace education is especially important in our time and day, when we see how we have been overcome by violence. We have even made violence a part of our entertainment, part of our leisure-time hobbies. For example, look at some films, there may be 250 incidents of violence in a film of 2,1/2 hours – unbelievable! TV-programs are often full of violence. So for understanding peace, non-violence and peace education are utterly imperative in our time. That's my reaction.
ÅB: Is it correct that you work at a center devoted to peace education?
AB: Yes, I have a center, which is a center for peace education, that gives and develops courses. There are work-shops both for students and teachers at different levels, college, university and also school levels. Then we develop courses, and we give consultancy. We are consulted by the National Council for Educational Research and Training in Education (NCERT) of India which helps introducing textbooks for teachers.
ÅB: Is this center part of a university?
AB: No. As one of the founders of the centre, I have stood for autonomy. I have learnt from Gandhian study that if you want to be creative, and if you want to be really free in your movement, then you must give up the habit of taking aid from the government. The government that governs the least, is the best government for me. So my center is a private organization, but I do also give lectures in a university, the J.N. University, which includes Gandhian studies.

Elise Boulding (Boulder, Colorado, USA)

I find the term itself evokes stereotypes in people's minds – as if there were some special course you could take. I prefer the term "peace learning" to "peace education". This shifts the emphasis to what goes on inside the learner rather than on something out there. (If you teach it right, people will understand what peace is and what they have to do.) So I have some resistance to the term itself.

ÅB: How would you then describe the area of "peace learning"?

EB: Partly I think of behavioral training, conflict resolution and so on, partly of understanding of the self, interpersonal dynamics, the integrity of individuals and of societies, and the need to respect people and work with them in ways that are mutually self-enhancing. I think that those are things that children can learn at a very early age. They can be put in very simple terms. You can teach very young children that if there is a conflict, then the only way to solve it is to make things better for the person you have a conflict with as well as for yourself. So there is a whole range of behavioral and perceptual things I include in peace learning.

Then I think, in a broader sense, we have to have a much better teaching of geography and history. Very few children in the United States have an adequate understanding of the world's geography, and they have very little understanding of history from the perspective of other cultures. For example, I find reading Islamic texts or world history is very rewarding in letting you see the world in a different way. Reading Chinese world history texts works in a similar way. I think we have to broaden our reading of history so we understand the human journey in much broader terms. Ethnocentrism is one of the major contributors to the building up of enemy images.

In my book "Building a Global Civic Culture" I have essentially put together what I have taught in peace studies classes. If you wonder what I think peace education is, try reading that book! Part of it deals with what I have just said – understanding history and geography better. I also put a lot of emphasis on understanding the complexity of interstate relationships. In the United States, we know about NATO and the Warsaw pact, but we don't understand the 2,000 different intergovernment organizations that do the work of the interstate system around the world. Even less understood and more important in the long run are the 18,000 nongovernmental organizations, which have come into being in this century.

What changed the world in the 20th century and will make the 21st century different, is the fact that people can develop and work for common interests across national borders independently of nation state policy. In the short run, these INGO's are weak. Very few of them have developed anything like their potentials, but in the long run I see a great hope in them. It's not what they are doing now, but what they *could* do that makes me hopeful. And they also *have* contributed very creatively, I think, to thinking in such areas as nuclear free zones, alternative security, non-offensive defense. Most activities in these areas come out of the nongovernmental organizations; that's where I look for solutions to our problems. I think students have to learn about that, and they have to learn to find their way around this meta network of 18,000 transnational networks.

In the United States, I have tried to use Unesco published books instead of the textbooks published in the U.S., so that students will understand the new international economic order, the new international cultural order, and the new international information order. These things are not reflected in stuff that's published in the U.S., so students usually don't get a proper chance to understand the present information order and the present culture. All of this to my mind is peace education.

Birgit Brock-Utne (Oslo, Norway)

Of course, both "peace" and "peace education" are used in many different ways. One observes differences in their use by governments in east and west, and one also finds differences in our western countries between conservative and social democratic governments. In Norway the conservatives associate peace education with defense and security and they have introduced something about NATO as a peace organization into their formulations. Personally, I think about entirely different peace organizations and it would never occur to me to call NATO a peace organization. The Social Democrats in Norway, when talking about peace education have been more concerned with discussing nonviolent solutions, and generally adopt a viewpoint closer to the reasoning in the recommendations of the UN and UNESCO.

To me, peace education implies both education *about* peace and education *for* peace. Education for peace is a broad subject, connected to democracy in school and the attempts to create an open and cooperative classroom at-

mosphere, among other things. It is quite natural for an educator to include such things. But if one approaches this subject from the point of view of political science, for example, or if one is a peace researcher of a more traditional kind, the tendency is rather to regard peace education as instruction *about* peace and war, and one is very often of the opinion that the primary objective is to disseminate the results of peace research.

I personally think that both things are important. There are some facts about which more information is needed, e.g. that it is not correct that the arms industry creates more employment opportunities. Furthermore, the general public has not been very well informed about a number of NATO doctrines.

The discussion of the concept of peace is an extremely important part of peace research. A number of young and more radical peace researchers have sometimes accused their senior colleagues of only thinking about peace as the absence of military violence, even when that can mean ignoring a great deal of injustice. The older peace researchers, for their part, have accused their junior colleagues of using the word "peace" where they really should use the word "revolution" and consequently marketing revolution under the label "peace". These are among the extremes in the debate. In all circumstances, it is important to observe different kinds of violence on different levels. Johan Galtung wrote about this in terms of direct and structural violence as early as the 1960s, but it has not always received adequate attention.

ÅB: There have been some discussions in Sweden about the term "fredsfostran" ("rearing/training for peace") vis-à-vis the term "fredsundervisning" ("peace-related instruction"). Has that also been discussed in Norway?

BB: Yes, to some extent. We encounter a difficulty in our languages which doesn't exist in English, where "education" covers both concepts. In English, on the other hand, a distinction is customarily made between "education *for* peace" which I would translate as "fostran till fred" and "education *about* peace". This type of peace education primarily involves cognition, and is usually taken up in the upper grades in school, whereas "fostran" or educating *for* peace is something that, in principle, is begun at birth.

ÅB: With regard to the input of the school, in Norway you usually talk mainly about "fredsundervisning". Is that true even when you think about the school's non-cognitive input?

BB: We are not particularly consistent in our use of terminology, but we tend to use the word "fredsundervisning" when we are dealing with the

formal institution called "school". Now that I have myself written about feminist perspectives on "peace education", I have distinguished between "peace education in the non-formal sector" (meaning upbringing, and influences from home, parents and peer groups, as well as from the leisure environment, e.g. sports, the media, and toys) and "peace education in the formal sector" (meaning what the schools have to offer). In my book I make a distinction between the formal curriculum of the school where one may talk of education *about* peace and the hidden curriculum where you find more of what I would call education *for* peace or,often, for oppression.

When Håkan Wiberg read the manuscript of my new book, he thought that I was rather too negative in my judgement of the school's possibilities. I have participated in a SIPRI project on cultural influences in relation to war and the environment, where I wrote about the education sector and others wrote about other areas. We remarked just recently, on the occasion of a general discussion, that we all seem to tend to be a little pessimistic when it comes to our special areas of competence. (Brock-Utne, B. "Formal Education as a Force in Shaping Cultural Norms towards War and the Environment", in Westling, A. (Ed.), "Cultural Norms in Relation to War and the Environment". Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.) Obviously there is much that can be done in school, but it is also perfectly obvious that the system one works in imposes certain limits. So what one can do then is to train students also to become critical to the educational system they are part of. (I am thinking, for example, of such things as the competition for grades.)

Robin Burns (Heidelberg, Victoria, Australia)

The first thing I think of is good education: that peace education implies a commitment not only to a certain educational content but to a pedagogy as well that gives teachers and students alike an opportunity to practice some of the skills and some of the values that peace education is concerned about transmitting.

ÅB: When you talk about specific skills that peace education should develop, what would you think of?

RB: I think very quickly of the ability to make a critique of the present social order and some of its structures – from the national to the global

arena – that I think are anti-peace. Children and adults need the ability to analyze the situation they are in, to reflect on that and to attempt to put some of their insights into practice as a basis then for new reflections.
ÅB: So you would see peace education as involved in both some kind of content and in the development of skills, attitudes and preparedness for action?
RB: Yes.

James Calleja (Valletta, Malta)

I think the word peace and the word education are the two most important words in our vocabulary. Basically our philosophy in Malta, if I may say so, focuses on peace education as that area of study where education influences peace strategies and peace strategies would influence education. We work on a concept which does *not* focus on peace as being the absence of something. Very often we hear that peace is the absence of structural or direct violence. With our students we try to undertake research leading to a concept of peace which is the presence or the essence of something else.
ÅB: When you think of the goals of peace education, as you see them, would they include more than knowledge? Would you, for example, also try to promote certain values?
JC: You can look at peace education as education *about* peace or education *for* peace. Basically what we do with our students is that we try to inculcate the idea that peace education is a dynamic process which they themselves could start on the basis of some theoretical framework that they themselves have personally discovered from readings, group discussions and research. This is why we have two units. What I teach is the theoretical background, with normally classical texts. It is a history of the ideas on peace. Then the second unit focuses on practical strategies in the classrooms, how to put these theories into practice. One important project which my students are working on at the moment is a manual for teachers in the primary school entitled "Education for Mutual Respect": A Teacher's Manual for the Study of Peace Education. I have given my students sort of a skeleton draft of the manual which we discuss and which we change and add to as we go along. In the appendix of this manual, we shall give – which I think is extremely important – some guidelines to the relevant literature, for example, texts on the United Nations as an organization,

literature on peace studies in general and on the philosophy of peace, and some literature on the Mediterranean. We want to give to Maltese teachers (who never had the opportunity to deal with peace education), an idea of what peace education is all about and give them some background. So we are working on this manual this year for primary school education, hoping that next year we proceed to secondary education and then to the incorporation of peace studies at the university level.
ÅB: Will this manual then be published and made available for teachers?
JC: Yes, this is our idea. After editing etc., this will be a manual which we will definitely distribute to teachers in our schools.

Terry Carson (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada)

"Peace education" tends to be education about war and peace. I prefer "education *for* peace"; I think this is a much broader term: an education preparing students to grow up in a secure and peaceful future. Environmental education, international understanding, non-violent conflict resolution, both at the local and the global level, would all be part of "education *for* peace".
ÅB: Would you include not only knowledge but also influences on attitudes, values and actions in that concept?
TC: Oh yes, education for a peaceful future is necessarily action-oriented and requires attention to skills, attitudes and values.

James Collinge (Wellington, New Zealand)

I see it as two things. I see it first of all as a curriculum question, that is when peace topics are discussed with young people. I feel it is extremely important to put such topics before young people and help them to develop critical attitudes, critical approaches to the important questions of peace and war, defence, violence in the community and violence in the media. I think that I would call this "peace studies" rather than peace education; I want to make that distinction.

When I think of peace education, I think of it as more than that, I think of it as a sort of global approach, and peace education to me entails also the means by which you teach. It means that you teach in a way that gives the maximum opportunity for students to develop their own approaches to the

work rather than having this laid down by the teacher. You teach in ways that emphasize cooperation rather than competition. You teach in an environment – and that is not just a classroom environment but a whole school environment – that emphasizes peaceful resolution of conflicts rather than formal discipline and that uses a whole set of processes that give people the opportunity to develop cooperative and democratic procedures. So the process to me is as important as the actual topics. That is what I think of as peace education. When I am feeling braver I use the expression "education for peace" rather than "peace education".
ÅB: What is the official name of your own course?
JC: It is "peace education".

Thomas Daffern (London, England)

I think first of a poem on "peace with work to do" – how much work there is to do, what a richness is in that.
ÅB: And if you think of it in terms more like a definition, how would you briefly state what you think of?
TD: I tend to define concepts in a process way, so I think in terms of education towards a state of peace which isn't yet there necessarily but is potentially within us. I see it as an educational process towards an optimal state of being. I was just reading Thomas of Aquino the other day, and he talks about peace as the supreme attribute with humanity, realized through love, and he develops a philosophy of teaching that I think we can still have insights from.
ÅB: If you think in terms of categories such as knowledge, insights, attitudes, values, behaviours etc., what would you like to think of as goals of peace education? Would that be knowledge and would there also be other things?
TD: It would be knowledge, yes, but I would emphasize that you must study in order to act, you can't divorce study and action. In practical terms, I think education for peace should include goals of fostering cooperation with people, altruism. I think people by nature are cooperative. My experience is that if you can only create the right conditions, you can manifest this latent altruism in people. Education seems to be in a sense Socratic: it's an act of remembering what we already know, it's a rediscovering of our latent good tendencies.

ÅB: What about values and attitudes? Do you think that it is a proper goal of peace education to promote certain values and attitudes?
TD: I wouldn't necessarily use the word "promote", but I would certainly try to cover values and attitudes which are there and can be fostered. I mean: Educators in a sense are leaders, or guides for a growth process.
ÅB: You would not like to use the word "promote", but you could think of using the word "foster"?
TD: Yes. Altruism and cooperation are all-embracing terms, but within that we can talk about caring, a concern for other people. The concept of love is very important. On the opposite side you have fear, jealousy and anger, within the educational system the whole competitive style of learning. But there is an old way of learning through love and through interests: you can foster people's own creativity without competition. Some people are good at this, some are good at that, and it's like we all are artists, creating a picture together, and the educator ideally is somehow working to coordinate in a network those growth processes. It can become a community process – a social pedagogy.

Morton Deutsch (New York, USA)

I have mixed feelings, frankly. There is a lot that goes under that broad title that I think is not well thought through and has a kind of general tender-heartedness and soft-mindedness. On the other hand, I think the values behind it are important and should be supported, and I think that there are essential educational efforts in that area that should be strengthened. Many schools do not provide much constructive social experience for their students, but there are many things they *could* do.
ÅB: If you should try to give some kind of definition of peace education that you yourself would be comfortable with, how would you like to formulate it?
MD: Basically I would say that peace education is educating people to learn to live in a cooperative world, to learn to manage the inevitable conflicts that occur in a constructive rather than in a destructive way.

Virginia Floresca-Cawagas (Quezon City, The Philippines)

First, in 1983, my idea of peace education was primarily nuclear disarmament education for the elimination of war and all kinds of conflicts on a global level. But now when I think of peace education I am thinking more of the lives of the people – the poor people. I am thinking more of social justice, the violation of human rights, the oppression, the destruction of the environment and all kinds of injustices. Ironically, it's the opposite of peace. When I think of peace education, I am thinking of how we can educate our people so that all these forms of injustices can be eliminated.

ÅB: Do you think of peace education as dealing primarily with information and knowledge or do you also include attitudes and values? That is, what would you include as goals or objectives for the peace education?

VFC: I would look at peace education in relation to three dimensions in the development of a person and society. First, we need basic information, we have to have knowledge; otherwise we will not be able to think rationally and make rational decisions. In addition to providing information, peace education should be able to develop the skill of rational thinking, critical thinking. But that is not enough. I think attitudes and values should also be reoriented towards the development of a more peaceful environment and a more peaceful community. So peace education for me should include knowledge, information, reason, as well as the capacity and inclination to care and to have concern for others.

ÅB: Do you also want to include an aspect of preparation for action in peace education?

VFC: Oh, yes. Peace education should address two questions related to attitudes and values. One is: What are these attitudes and values that we should develop? And the second is: What should we do to be able to translate these attitudes and values into critical action? For me peace education would be merely an academic exercise if it does not motivate people to commit themselves to social action.

ÅB: Could you give examples of what you primarily think of when talking about values?

VFC: In our work in the Philippines we have identified and redefined some core values which we might call our shared values, namely: social responsibility, economic self-sufficiency, respect for human rights, cultural solidarity, environmental care, and a deep sense of spirituality. In peace education and values education, these are the values that we feel are necessary. They

are universal, but in terms of their application there might be differences between countries or cultural areas.

Celina Garcia (San José, Costa Rica)

Total social transformation, total social revolution that is peaceful, non-violent, but a total transformation. I don't believe in reformations. I think habits of violent solutions are very deeply ingrained in our persons, in our families, and in our social structures, so at least we need to try to bring about a radical transformation. When I think about peace education, I think about total transformation. I don't have all the answers on how to do this, but this is my image and ambition.

Henk B. Gerritsma and Daan Verbaan (Groningen, The Netherlands)

DV: In general, peace education is education about international problems which form a threat to our world. In the tradition of the peace-education department in Groningen we work in three main problem areas: the under-development of the Third World, the pollution of our environment, and war and conflicts between and within states.

In a more narrow definition, peace education is focused on the problem of peace and war between and within states. Peace education wants to make a clear analysis of those conflicts and it tries to stress the possibilities of a peaceful solution of conflicts. Therefore it stresses peace initiatives and tries to put the problems in as hopeful a perspective as possible.

In both definitions, peace education is political education in the sense that it tries to teach children how to handle such problems; that is, how to form their opinions about these problems and how to work on a solution.

HG: I conceive peace education in the first place as peace learning and peace studies: as education in global conflicts and problems, aimed at awareness and knowledge of and insight into these conflicts and problems, and the need for and possibility of political change. Peace education is conceived especially as problem-oriented political education, with the emphasis on transferring knowledge of and insight into the backgrounds, causes and characters of the global conflicts and problems which threaten peace, as well as on possibilities and proposals for peaceful conflict regulation and

resolution, and for limiting and solving problems. As a consequence, the emphasis should be on the development of teaching materials and curricula, based on theories, knowledge and insights from conflict and peace research and related scientific disciplines. In the Netherlands we call this approach "direct" or "explicit" peace education.

There is another approach which we call "indirect" or "implicit" peace education. It is characteristic for that approach that peace education is conceived especially as teaching values related to peace. The difference from the first approach is that implicit peace education has a more general and less political character. The emphasis is on moral education, with peace as a central value. Education should promote peace in thought, attitudes and conduct. As a consequence, peace education is conceived as education for peace, through a pedagogical/educational 'climate' which is determined by peace as a central value. The criticism of this approach was, and is, that peace is used too exclusively as a pedagogical concept, and not at all, or too little, as a political concept; and that, thereby, peace education remains too general, not enough concerned with the concrete geo-political conflicts and problems.

Both approaches are necessary and essential. But, in my opinion, peace education should primarily be explicit peace learning (and, on a higher level, peace studies). Otherwise, there is the risk of restricting it to a general, especially pedagogical/educational concept/principle.

Haim Gordon (Beer-Sheva, Israel)

My first feeling is that peace education always has to be tied to developing a sense of justice, and that means that it really is tied to a certain kind of character education. Peace education cannot just be a discussion of conflicts and how they can be resolved. It has to go much deeper, it has to develop a sense of justice and deal with how to educate a child. That is what I think of first when I hear the words "peace education".

Magnus Haavelsrud (Tromsø, Norway)

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the expressions "fredsfostran" and "fredsundervisning"?

(Note: The interview was not carried out in English, but – as is natural between a Swede and a Norwegian – in both the Scandinavian languages involved; in this case questions in Swedish and answers in Norwegian. "Fredsfostran" and "fredsundervisning" can both be translated by "peace education", but they have usually different connotations, approximately "rearing/training for peace" and "peace-related instruction".)

MH: I think I prefer "fredsundervisning", and by that I refer to people's understanding of the world we live in, among other things. Consciousness-raising may be a keyword. I'm influenced by Freire's concepts of dialogue and understanding, so it's important for me to speak about both content and form and the context in which it takes place. Consequently I want to talk about a content that has not been defined in advance but that is defined by means of a dialogue among the participants. In other words, I attach great importance to the fact that the participants themselves should be involved and establish the premises for the choice of subject-matter, as well as to the fact that the subject-matter is gradually changed by means of dialogue. In this way, the experiences of the individual are expanded, and we can witness a gradual insight into larger areas as well as an awareness of new connections.

ÅB: You said that you prefer the term "fredsundervisning". Do you also use the expression "fredsfostran" or "fredsoppdragelse"?

MH: No, I think "fredsundervisning" is the most important thing. To me, the term "fostran" implies that there's a need for change. I don't have the impression that children experience the need for becoming something different from what they are as far as issues of peace are concerned. Nor do I have the urge to change children. The fact that children become bellicose – I think that's a question of preventing things from happening to children rather than changing the children. So I don't think changing people is the main point.

Ian M. Harris (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA)

When I first heard the words "peace education", I was excited because it occurred to me that I could develop my professional life doing something that I really wanted to do. When I was younger, most specifically when I was in college, the Vietnamese war was going on and I was involved in anti-war activities. When the war ended in 1975, I was involved with

getting my doctorate, getting an academic job, earning tenure, and publishing. My major fields were community development, social change strategies, and I had not specifically worked in the peace area. But as soon as I saw the words "peace education" or the concept of peace education as a topic for my own course hit me, I realized that I could take my interest in change strategies and injustice – which had been strong – and apply them in my academic life by teaching a course called "Peace education".

Petra Hesse (Boston, Massachusetts, USA)

Well, it's biased by what my own work is about, so I think first of classrooms with small children, primarily kindergarten and elementary schools and our own work on peace education. I think of multi-cultural education, making children appreciate the differences in customs, habits, language – the physical differences in cultures as well as the more subtle emotional and social differences.

My own research indicates that children are wary of people who look different, people who are strangers, people who somehow speak differently, look differently or have slightly different habits. So when I think of peace education, ideally I think of completely multi-cultural classrooms, where children representing different races and different cultures are combined, but whether that's possible depends very much on where you conduct your peace education. I also think of peace education as a training of children in empathy with people who are different. So basically I believe that peace education should consist of making sure that children can identify with people who might be different from them. I can see from my own research that young children have a tough time taking the perspective of others. Therefore, they should be encouraged and trained while still young to take the perspective of others. Then it also relates to my research on children's media in this country, where children are systematically taught that somebody who looks different is evil. That's a very common theme in children's cartoon shows. I want children to see the similarities between themselves and other people, they should feel for other people who are in pain.

And then I think of peace education as a training in conflict resolution skills that does acknowledge that children as well as adults are often in conflict. The fact that human beings are often in conflict, and are often ag-

gressive doesn't mean that their conflicts have to lead to violence. So what we have been encouraging is creative conflict resolution in the classroom, letting children brainstorm about alternatives to punching each other: What are some of the strategies that can be used? Can they always use words, or are there alternatives to using words? How do they come to some kind of agreement on or resolution of their conflicts that is short of violence but also doesn't ignore the conflict? I definitely don't believe in ignoring conflicts.

In the classroom we may let the children pledge their allegiance to the planet, encouraging children to empathize with other groups. But I also think that something has to happen to get children to have a relationship with nature, to have a relationship with people all over the world and also with the whole earth. Hence I think part of peace education should also be some form of environmental education. I would also encourage them to identify with other species, like animals and nature that is threatened by environmental destruction. I would encourage children at an early age to do things that they can do. I would like to empower even very young children to feel that they can make a difference in the world. Even five-year-olds can do a few things to contribute to cleaning up the environment, for example.

David Hicks (Bath, England)

I first think of a process of education. Obviously most of my work has been within the context of classrooms in England and that colours everything that I say. Certainly when peace educators were very active during the early and mid 80s one focus was on the process: What do teaching and learning processes look like in schools, which are non-hierarchical, which promote students' autonomy, students' self-respect, debate and dialogue between students and between students and teachers?

ÅB: What would be some of the aims or objectives of peace education as you see them?

DH: Helping young people understand some of the origins of conflicts, understand manifestations of direct and structural violence, but also equally understanding concepts of peace: What does peace actually look like, what does it feel like, what does it taste and smell like, how do we know when we've got it? One part of that deals with encouraging young people's

visions and dreams in as practical a way as possible.
ÅB: Would you say that you would cover both knowledge and attitudes?
DH: Yes. One of the things I used a lot with teachers on in-service courses and that I used in the book for teachers was a breakdown of knowledge, attitudes and skills, spelling out various substantive areas that I felt could be looked at, as well as attitudes that should be promoted and skills that needed to be developed.

Kathleen Kanet (New York, USA)

My own concept of peace education is constantly evolving and growing. Right now what comes to my mind is quality education, the kind of education that we need in order to have an enhancement of life, so that we can all live together peacefully and joyfully on this planet. Peace education has to be concerned about full equality and mutuality, and this has to be part of the content and methodology. It has to be concerned about having as full participation as possible. Constitutive to justice is that each of us has the right to participate in decisions which affect our lives. It has to be concerned about human rights, both economic and political; it has to be concerned about economic justice. It needs to deal with environmental viability, concern for creation. Dealing creatively with conflict or non-violently with conflict is also an important element. Conflict has always been a part of life, but the task is to see it positively and to see it as something that can be dealt with non-violently. So I see all of those areas as components constitutive to peace education.

In 1981 I worked with a colleague who was an educational consultant, and together we developed a course of studies that would be relevant for high school or college. The title was "A Specter of Nuclear War – Why the World Lives in Its Shadow". We started out with: Why in 1981 is the world at the brink of possible nuclear disaster? Why has not the UN been more efficient; why have they failed? What has gone wrong? So we developed a whole course of studies, beginning with the conceptualization of the scientific communities' involvement in the development of the bomb. I think that it is important that this kind of intellectual content, discussion and dialoque and the important concerns of the day be part of the curriculum. I think it is a necessary goal that history of present-day issues be explored. I don't think that the curriculum itself should take a particular viewpoint, except

maybe one on which we would all agree, that we want a world that is humane. But the issues should be explored from all sides. Maybe that was part of the difficulty with the so-called disarmament education, because it already was biased, so that it had negative impact on some people who were not so sure that disarmament was the answer. And yet maybe it was a good contribution historically when it did come out about 12 years ago.

ÅB: So intellectual analysis of present-day problems has to be an important part of peace education?

KK: Yes.

ÅB: And other aspects, such as skills, values and preparedness for action, would they also be part of peace education according to your view?

KK: Yes. That was part of our question when the five of us got together. And our particular approach says: What we are going to focus on are concepts. The conceptual approach is appropriate for any age – a little child can learn certain concepts. The concepts, the values, the skills and the attitudes are part of a conceptual framework. You keep reinforcing over the years a certain value base, a certain way of looking at things, a certain way of judging. I guess the approach is biased in a sense because we do have a body of values which comes from the Gospel and the social doctrine of the church, but I think we would accept what we do also have a bias starting from the universal declaration of human rights or from other global documents. So when someone says: "You are teaching values, so you are biased", we say yes, but this is the basis which we have, and it has really very wide support.

Søren Keldorff (Aalborg, Denmark)

Well, I suppose I think about it in a complex way, just as I've already tried to talk about it. And I might add here that these problems haven't become less complex just because I have been working with them for the last 5 or 6 years.

In my opinion, it's a question of finding suitable ways of creating a new kind of responsibility towards human beings, nature and our green globe so that all kinds of manifest and concealed (structural) violence are counteracted and so that the individual is made responsible for himself or herself as well as for this totality in cooperation with other people across sexual, cultural, national and racial borderlines. The final goal is a global responsi-

bility or a global ethics concentrating on ecological as well as peace-oriented issues. There are many stages in this process, and they should be constructed in different ways depending on the particular inter-human and pedagogical contexts that apply. In order to indicate the extremes, it may concern anything from getting enthusiastic about the many magnificent colours displayed by a butterfly or a sunset at sea to – as I mentioned in connection with the "workshops of the future" – creative, half-therapeutic attempts to envisage, via "travels in imagination", a world without elements of violence and destruction that are created by human beings.

Herbert C. Kelman (Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA)

What I think of first is in fact education at the level of primary and secondary schools. If I think of it as a field, I think of how the concept of peace, and the issues of war and peace more generally and the danger of nuclear war more specifically, are introduced into the school curriculum. That is what I think of first as peace education.

But many of the things that I said in my answer to question 1 were essentially ways of looking more broadly at the concept of peace education as related both to the university level and to public education and applying it to the political arena itself, where I can see conflict resolution work as performing a major educational function. I would also argue, as I did in my answer to question 1, that peace research and the development of new conceptual approaches to many issues is part of a larger process of peace education.

ÅB: When you think of peace education, do you think of it as mostly a cognitive thing or do you also include attitudes, values and behavior tendencies?

HK: It is a tricky thing, and one has to make certain distinctions. If you talk about peace education in the schools, one has to be careful to distinguish it from propaganda or indoctrination which is promoting a particular standpoint. But at the same time I don't see any way in which one can meaningfully contribute to students' thinking about peace without addressing attitudes. For example, I was expressing an assumption about personal responsibility and about personal efficacy. When you want to direct education towards enhancing the sense of efficacy and enhancing the feeling that the individual has to take some responsibility for public policy, this certainly

involves attitudes. I would also argue that these are really extensions of what we mean by education in the first place. What we mean by education is not just to instill a certain set of skills or a certain set of facts – it is also to develop an attitude to the world. In what I see as liberal education, you would like the students to become persons who actively confront the environment. So I think there are certain implicit values in education, and one has to make choices. In that sense I don't feel that we can avoid thinking of the process as both cognitive and attitudinal, value-related.

Alberto L'Abate (Florence, Italy)

You can see from what I have already told you what I feel is important: non-violence, open communication etc. But education is a word that I do not like very much in this connection. What we deal with is the formation or development of character. Of course, there is important information about arms, for example; but it is more important to help people not to be afraid, to overcome fear, and to have the courage to do the things they think are right.

Linda Lantieri (New York, USA)

In the United States, when people began to think of this area over a decade ago, most first thought of the nuclear situation. At first we saw peace education as looking at the issues of growing up in a nuclear age. Our program has taken a different route although not completely dissimilar. I would say the core of our program is creative conflict resolution and intercultural understanding. Our emphasis is on teaching young people to solve conflicts more creatively and helping them find alternatives to dealing violently with conflicts. As part of that, peace education to me is things like teaching young people how to cooperate with one another, teaching young people to respect and celebrate individual differences they see in themselves and others. *World* peace, justice issues and prejudice reduction comes to mind when I think of peace education. It is also important to help young people develop images of a positive future and help them to feel empowered enough to make a difference in their future. We need to bring a sense of hope back – that we can turn the tide. So all of those things come

to mind when I think of peace education.
ÅB: Do you also include in peace education the larger society?
LL: Yes, we do. We start off at a very personal level, we talk about our community and then we bring it to a global level. We also, as part of the program, help young people have a more global consciousness. We are involved in several different projects that involve sister school relationships. For example, we have a sister school relationship with young people in India, the Soviet Union, Nicaragua and Alaska. We really welcome learning about other cultures through exchanging drawings, poetry or letters. In the case of India we are exchanging videos. We are talking to one another through the media.
ÅB: Would you say that your objectives focus mostly on the side of knowledge and insights, or you would say that it also deals with attitudes, values and readiness to act?
LL: I would say it's more the latter. In our curriculum (about 250 pages), we are very much looking at the concepts of peace, conflict and conflict resolution first. Then our approach is to teach kids very practical skills such as active listening, mediation and negotiation for dealing with conflicts. Our aim is to help young people learn very specific ways they can begin to have their behavior make a difference. So attitudes, values and readiness to act are very important in our program.

Max Lawson (Armidale, New South Wales, Australia)

Well, I think of resolution of conflict in turn to build a more socially just world. I appreciate the quote from the Bible: the harvest of the seeds of peace is true justice.

Stig Lindholm (Copenhagen, Denmark; Sweden)

Personally, I think it is important not to confine ourselves to what is conventionally perceived as peace; I would like to include both development and human rights in this context. I believe that human rights are an important area, and I think that when the perspective of action is considered, it is a very good thing to include it, because this is an area where there are activities that students and treachers can get involved in, for example in

Amnesty. I would like to add ecology to peace, development and human rights, but then it turns into such a long title, and you risk having a pedagogy for all that is good, so you have to make a selection. Then I prefer to make ecology part of what I call "development".

As far as "fostran" ("rearing/training") is concerned, I have been a bit allergic to that term, and I think that is due to what generation you belong to. In actual fact, it should be a good thing, because as far as I can understand, "fostran" has to do with ethics and values. On the one hand, then, I have renounced that term, but on the other hand I have begun to consider whether it might be reintroduced in one way or another. But "fostran" sounds so authoritarian. The best thing would be if a new term could be found. If you go outside the school situation, can you talk about "fostran" of your fellow human beings in this area? I am not at all sure about that.

Therefore I am calling my area of interest "a pedagogy for development and peace" for the time being. It corresponds to "development and peace education" in English.

Mildred Masheder (London, England)

I think of several things: education for real democracy, education for future citizens to be able to make their choices in the world. An awareness of what is going on in the world is an important component. I think also it comprises aspects like being sure of yourself, being confident. It includes the listening process and cooperation.

For me the climate and the atmosphere of the home and the school are very important. I am very much opposed to much of our educational system at present, because I think it is far too authoritarian, far too prone to make children feel inferior, to make them feel inadequate.

ÅB: You used the expression education for "real" democracy. Can you say something more about that?

MM: I use that because I don't think we educate for democracy at all, even though we might *talk* about democracy. "Real" here means "in practice". Learning has to be based on activity and personal experience. Much later comes theory. But most schools do not let their children have any personal experience with democratic decision-making. Some schools may from time to time use a mock election, but that is very superficial.

Gerald F. Mische (New York, USA)

When I see "peace education", my first reaction is that most people think that it is dealing merely with war prevention. For us, however, peace education is very much related to problems of justice and economic questions. So for us peace education means to understand the different areas and sources of conflict and then to look at alternatives. It deals with security in this broader sense. It's not just a question of looking at the process of war or to help people change visions of the enemy, to deal with the images of the enemy. But it also has to look at what kind of international systems we have and what kind of alternatives that exist.

Valentina Mitina (Moscow, Russia)

Earlier we didn't use the term "peace education", but we talked about "international education", and although the meaning is different, it is related in some respects. Later on we began to use the expression "peace education". Thinking about the essence of the activity, I got accustomed to that many, many years ago when I started my work at school. Later on we had to coordinate the ideas of international education we had at our school with some of the ideas that were not present in our work in international education, but which are now seen as part of peace education.
ÅB: Is the term "peace education" or the translation of it used in your country widely?
VM: Yes, it is. We are developing a theoretical base for peace education.

Robert Muller (Escazu, Costa Rica; New York, USA)

Well, it is the fact that we need an education towards a new culture, a new civilization where problems are not solved by violent ways and means, but by intelligent peaceful ways. This represents a vast gamut of challenges that reach from peace in the family, peace among the sexes, peace among the generations, peace among the professions, peace among the religions, peace among nations, peace at the summit of the world, to peace in the airs and in outer-space.

Peace in my opinion means mostly non-violence. It is not a hundred per

cent ideal state. If someone asks me: How do you define peace, I would say: My father in Lorraine, who was a hat-maker, or a simple peasant would tell me what peace is, namely when there is no violence and no excessive trouble. There will always be *some* trouble, some violence. This is why we have a police. But as long as, on the whole, there is no real worrisome violence and trouble, we can say that we have peace in a country or on this planet.

Today we are changing from the period of human history when we thought that there would always be wars and violence among groups of people, to a new era, when we believe that peace can and will be the normal way of human beings to live together. This requires a new set of societal rules which must be taught right from the start to children.

The greatest compliment I have received was when the recreation attendant and gardener of the Robert Muller school in Arlington, a Mexican, said to me: "Mr Muller, I have never seen two children fight with each other in this school." This is how one would like to see the whole human society behave, and it starts in school. This is the great merit of teaching children to live in peace with each other.

Eva Nordland (Oslo, Norway)

To me, the most important results of peace education in the schools are the pupils' attitudes and expectations, that which is sometimes called second-order learning. Certain factual knowledge and skills are central to a learning situation; they are the immediate content or "the text". The "context" is those habits, attitudes and expectations that develop gradually as a consequence of the text and the atmosphere you work in. I don't want to call something peace education proper as long as it's just a matter of "text" (learning simple facts about war and peace), but only when the "context" is included. Then I use the term "habits" about that which is least at the focus of attention, that which has turned into automatized, unexamined actions. Attitudes are somewhat more conscious, and expectations even more so.

ÅB: Two terms have been used in the Swedish discussion: "fredsfostran" ("rearing/training for peace") and "fredsundervisning" ("peace-related instruction"). Would you like to comment on those terms?

EN: To me, the term "fredsfostran" is more oriented towards a wider peace pedagogy input, where the "context" plays a certain role, whereas the term

"fredsundervisning" in its traditional sense is more oriented towards what I call "text". But words change their meanings as you use them, and therefore I don't want us to argue too much about terminology. But I'm not so keen on talking about "fredsfostran" unless the atmosphere has also been included. You can give "fredsundervisning" in an authoritarian atmosphere, and you can give it in an atmosphere where the element of competition takes priority; but under those circumstances it's not "fredsfostran" in my sense of the word. But, as I already said, it all depends on how you choose to define your terms, so definitions are more important than the words themselves.

Mitsuo Okamoto (Hiroshima, Japan)

Well, we have a very special history of peace education in Japan, which was started mainly by the Hiroshima-Nagasaki survivors and later joined by teachers. Because peace education is often seen as connected with leftist politics, when you say peace education, some people who claim to be neutral have certain reservations whether one should support it or not. So I don't use the word peace education, but peace studies, to make the content – which is nothing but peace education – more acceptable to people who have some standard preconceived idea about what peace education is. Also, I feel that I can include more subject matter in peace studies than we would under the heading of peace education. For example, violence against nature, the destruction of nature can easily be included in peace studies. For the university level, the term peace studies I think, gives, some impression of a) a more comprehensive content and b) a more higher-education oriented subject matter than peace education.

ÅB: When you think of the school level, would you then use the term peace education, or would you use the expression peace studies also for the younger students?

MO: I have been thinking about this possibility, but I think peace studies may sound a little too sophisticated for elementary school children, for example.

ÅB: Would you like to think of peace education as also including other things than knowledge? Would it also deal with values and attitudes, for example?

MO: Yes, definitely. It must include not only knowledge, cognition, but

also values and attitudes. In addition, the teaching must be more experience-oriented. Transferring knowledge to one another is not enough, so I usually take students to places like Hiroshima and Nagasaki or to an island in the Philippines where people live in a very poor situation. It is very stimulating for students, because they see what real poverty is, and they experience what the Hiroshima people have been suffering. I arrange conversations with the survivors from Hiroshima and Nagasaki for the students. These people are aging and very fond of talking with young people, and the students are excited to talk with these people and share their experience, and this is a very stimulating encounter.

Priscilla Prutzman (Nyack, New York, USA)

I tend to think of peace education in terms of training conflict resolution and I imagine all the themes of CCRC (Children's Creative Response to Conflict) – cooperation, communication, affirmation, conflict resolution, mediation and bias awareness – are very important for peace education. Our approach has been very much experiential, modelling this as much as possible in our own lives. Conflict resolution has been something that we have tried to integrate into everything that we do in the school and in our own personal lives.

ÅB: It's quite natural that you see what you are doing as part of peace education, but would there be parts of peace education that go outside of what you are doing?

PP: Yes. I think we are not as involved with human rights, for instance. Our program has been primarily on the elementary level, and it has been natural then to focus on: how can we create a peaceful classroom right here. Peace education in general is a broader area than we usually work with.

ÅB: What grade levels are you mostly dealing with?

PP: CCRC mostly deals with kindergarten to grade 8, but occasionally we do work on the secondary level. And we do a lot of workshops with teachers, parents and other adult groups.

Hanns-Fred Rathenow (Berlin, Germany)

Peace education is, in my opinion, not only a theory but also a special approach to help pupils and students understand their society and its development and to live and act politically, to act locally and later globally in such a way as to help to overcome conflicts at all levels – at the interpersonal level, the community level, the national level, and the international level. I share with several definitions on peace education a concern also for what Galtung termed structural violence in addition to physical violence. The economical relations between the industrialized and the so-called underdeveloped countries are a good example of structural violence in my view. For example, look at the relationship between a hamburger and the tropical rain forest in South America. Rain forests were being destroyed so cattle could be put out to pasture, before becoming beef for an American hamburger chain of stores. Only after non-violent protests from ecological activists, which damaged hamburger sales, were the rain forests no longer in such great danger from the cattle industry.

Peace education is also concerned with the issue of prejudices and enemy images and with the issue of human rights. It has to do with appreciation of other peoples' values related to one's own perceiving the world. It has to do with empathy: to learn how to look at other cultures from one's own perspective and to look at one's own values from the perspective of others. It also has to do with the preservation of the cultural heritage of mankind as well as the conservation of natural resources.

Douglas Ray (London, Ontario, Canada)

Among other things, I think of disarmament education and perhaps education for nuclear disarmament. These were things associated with such persons as Einstein, Bertrand Russell and so on, so we are going back 30 or 40 years in that connection. However, it is quite clear that several other ideas have to be addressed, because you might have an absence of bombs and shooting, but still not have a just world. So peace education in the words of Galtung should deal with positive peace as well, trying to create the conditions where war is less likely or where quarreling is less likely, and where differences of opinion would be dealt with in some more sane manner than shooting at one another. Trying to create the conditions where

the necessary changes will be identified and steps will be taken towards carrying them out are very critical in the development of peace, and I think that is part of peace education. Conflict resolution stages have to be addressed, and people have to be persuaded that even if they have the *power* to impose their will upon the other, they do not have such a *right*. There has to be a sense of justice in these kinds of decisions, just as we have abandoned duels as the means of resolving conflicts between individuals.

Betty Reardon (New York, USA)

I think of peace education as a very broad field that includes all kinds of different teaching approaches based on various assumptions on what causes conflict etc. Basically, what binds all approaches to peace education together is the notion that violent conflict is not only generally destructive but threatens most of the other social goals or the "goods of the society", so that somehow there has to be an education that helps people to end violence or handle conflicts non-violently. While the most important phenomenon is the conflict and violence of war, structural violence is also significant. Not all who are interested in peace education are equally interested in structural violence, but my own view is that there is an interplay between structural and direct violence and that you have to understand the general system including both types of violence.

Tom Roderick (New York, USA)

We called what we did in ESR in those early years "nuclear age education", not "peace education". People thought that the word peace was too much associated with communism, that the word had been in a sense corrupted and that we represented a new mind, and so we needed a new label, and that was the term "nuclear age education". Nuclear issues were the focus of ESR in the beginning. We knew that the whole issue of nuclear weapons was very controversial.

ESR developed an approach to teaching about controversial issues that was based on the idea of dialogue, of presenting students with multiple points of view on issues and teaching critical thinking skills and helping them make up their own minds. We certainly wanted young people to

decide that there were alternatives to the arms race, but the leadership of ESR tried to be scrupulously fair in presenting opposing points of view to students and encouraging them to make up their own minds. As educators we felt it wasn't appropriate to use the schools to promote one particular solution to the arms race, or any kind of ideology. We wanted to put the issue of the nuclear arms race on the agenda of the schools, and on the agenda of the society, for people to talk about and think about and decide about in a democratic fashion. Our feeling was that it had been left up to the so-called experts, that the public had not been involved. Suddenly, in the 80s, we found ourselves in a situation where the end of the world literally was a possibility, where scientists could no longer assure us that if there was a nuclear war, human life would go on. So we were part of the movement saying: Stop, look what's happening. Many people were simply saying: Stop this madness! We were saying: Stop and think, and let's devote all of our energies to looking at this critically, examining various alternatives and choosing the best one.

I think this educational effort first became concrete and real for me when we started the program with the public schools in New York. What happened was that Linda Lantieri from the NYC Board of Education and I both gave workshops at a nuclear issues conference sponsored by the NYC Board of Education. A person who worked with Community School District 15 in New York City came to that conference. He attended our workshops, and he went away feeling that something had to be done about these issues in his District. The superintendent in District 15 took an interest, and Linda Lantieri and I started working together. We presented the teachers with a variety of options about what peace education could mean in their District, and they chose to focus on creative conflict resolution.

For a couple of years, we called the program "The Model Peace Education Program", and then, as we expanded the program beyond that district into other districts, we found that the term peace education was getting in our way – it was raising questions in people that were distracting – and so we decided to change the name to "The Resolving Conflict Creatively Program", which we felt more accurately reflected what the program was about.

Paul Rogers (Belfast, Northern Ireland)
& Maura Ward (Blackrock, Co. Dublin, Ireland)

PR: What I would think of first would be my job: Something that's good to be involved in, something that is very valuable, something that isn't just the normal run of the mill, something that could make a difference to people's lives and help make the world a better place. For the past thirteen years I've seen very positive and encouraging developments in peace education and this is extremely heartening.
MW: Yes, I think I would feel the same as Paul: Peace education is something worthwhile. It deals not only with disarmament, but with people at peace with themselves and others, peace with justice. In school, it should be part of many subjects, not just standing alone. It should be further promoted through the ethos of the school so that what the students experience in their interaction with others is not at variance with the values taught.

We look on peace education as a permanent response to conflict in general with the corresponding necessity to develop a positive approach both to peacemaking and to the development of people who internalise a live vision of peace, have a real sense of justice, personal and social, are sensitised to the various social manifestations of violence and conflict in their own lives and in the wider world, have the knowledge, skills and motivation to work effectively, opposing violence, dealing constructively with conflict and actively building peace in the different situations in which they find themselves, have a personal commitment to non-violence, both as a way of life and as a means of changing society with the necessary skills, knowledge and attitude.
PR: It aims at improved relations at all levels (personal, national and international), as well as at improved self-awareness or self-image, involving a feeling of empowerment.

Bogdan Rowiński (Konstancin, Poland)

I think that this is one of the most important areas of education. To me, first of all, this is a positive education: it is education towards something – real peace. But it also includes negative education, it is education against something – against armament and the arms race etc. This is an education which starts at birth, and it never ends.

ÅB: If you were to say something more specific about what you would strive for in peace education, could you give some examples?
BR: In general, this is education to prepare people to change the world in a positive way, and to make them feel that they are able to change it. You feel you can do something, and if you feel this, you are responsible, so the next step is education towards responsibility. This is in general terms, and of course we can also set up different particular goals for different age levels.

At the kindergarten level, for example, the children do not have wide knowledge, so we have to focus on creating positive emotions towards other children – black children, yellow children and people from other countries. We have to teach them how to cooperate on the globe, so this will be an aim of education at the lowest level. Then, the more mature our boys and girls are, the more we can spell out more detailed aims in three areas: knowledge, values and motivation.
ÅB: When you say values, what values would you especially think about in this context?
BR: I think that peace itself is a value, but it is not enough to describe it in this way. To make peace we need social justice, social care and other things which, taken together, mean peace. We have to develop those values in our students that make them able to create peace in a broad sense. This includes, for example, choosing non-violent ways of solving problems.

Paul Smoker (Yellow Springs, Ohio, USA)

In England, many people think differently about "peace education" and "education for peace". People who talk about "peace education" generally are talking about conveying a better understanding of theories, of information, of facts about problems of peace and war. It is an intellectual type of approach to the topic, which is the one that for the most part we have to adopt in universities and we do adopt in the university.

However, many people speak about "education for peace", and they think about having people in school get used to peace as a natural living experience in the classroom, focusing on the educational process, the pedagogical principles involved. My own personal bias is towards that approach, and in a perfect world that is the approach I would like to take. I have been trained as a teacher, and I was then a student of the methods of A.S. Neill. I be- lieved in his approach to education, with its emphasis on democratic ex-

perience in the classroom situation. But unfortunately, since we work in a less than ideal world, these principles are often difficult to carry out, for example, at the university although, in my own institute, we do discuss things, treat each other as equals, and as much as possible we try to take each others' views into account; it's not a hierarchical operation. So when I think about peace education, I think about these two different approaches to it and the advantages and disadvantages of both.

Recently we had to develop a syllabus for use in schools in Britain, a peace studies syllabus. It was a major break-through to get the examination bodies to consider that they could include such a syllabus in a curriculum for schools. The Joint Matriculation Board had agreed to do this. I've been working upon this project for about five years now – it took us some years to persuade them that this was a legitimate intellectual exercise, and now we are putting together a syllabus. This is "peace education", because the syllabus says nothing about how the teaching should be conducted in the classroom, about the spirit in the classroom, about the participation of students, but it talks about content. And obviously I personally am not terribly happy about that; but on the other hand, I realize that it would be quite impossible for me to get the Joint Matriculation Board to agree to the other approach, and I would rather have this than nothing.

There are many teachers who do not agree with this. They take the view that, in fact, peace education in this academic sense is not a good idea and are quite strongly opposed to it. They argue that it gives a false idea of what the peace process is really about, that the peace process is really about good, personal relationships, about participating in the classroom, about democratic participation in life. They feel that the hidden curriculum involved in teaching peace, as if it were physics, is doing a disservice. I respect that view and in fact part of me, unfortunately, agrees with that. So I have mixed feelings about this. But on the other hand I do think there is a merit indeed in knowledge and intellectual understanding about problems of peace and war regardless of the way the classroom is organized.

Toh Swee-Hin (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada)

I must confess that initially, especially in the seventies in the Western countries, peace education was very much connected with the "disarmament movement" or the "peace movement", and I had that idea as well. However,

as I began to collaborate with Australian peace educators, people like Jen Burnley and Robin Burns for example, I shared their view that peace education should not be restricted to disarmament issues. I think that in Australia, over the last ten years, we have been able to establish a consensus about this. It is very rare nowadays, when people in Australia hear about peace education, that they would think that it is just about disarmament. Among teachers the holistic concept is very much the idea now.

This is true in the Philippines also. Development education has been around for some time, but some of that work has not been very holistic; others have worked with environmental issues, or with human rights issues. Our work in the Philippines has been to help some of those groups actually to see their connections. That has been our ambition in the workshops we arranged for people in NGOs (non-governmental organizations) so that their members could broaden their own conception of their task.

ÅB: When you think of the goals of peace education, would you include knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, behavior tendencies, or would you just think of some of these?

TS: We have a broad view also when thinking about the goals. When talking about knowledge, we do not just mean content, but also understanding based on theoretical analysis. But at the same time, all the academic understanding in the world will not change the world for the better, make it more peaceful, if we do not translate the understanding into action. We need to teach empowerment, the commitment that one has the responsibility to try to change the world, not only as individuals but particularly in collaboration with other people – joining hands with others to effect social action. For us, peace education involves not only the content but also the pedagogy, as well as the empowerment – in order to bring about transformation. We all as peace educators need to be able to stand in front of our students and in our conversations and dialogues with them confess: Look, I am not a saint, I don't claim to be especially peaceful, but I try as much as I can also to actively engage in peace action.

Another point that I want to clarify here is that peace action is not necessarily the same as easily visible actions in rallies or big demonstrations. I agree that these are often important in the process of making the world more peaceful. But for us in education, we have a particular responsibility in trying to change the way classrooms and schools are often structured. We cannot have social, political or economic peace in a world without also having a peaceful educational system. We need to transform

the educational system structurally and organizationally. This is one of our tasks as educators. This work is not as visible as protests in the streets, but it is equally action. I think it also means taking risks, because we may need to challenge power structures within education. We may need to challenge those who are in charge of administrative decision-making.

Judith Torney-Purta (College Park, Maryland, USA)

Teaching strategies to solve conflicts, helping young people to understand various views about how wars begin, and giving them basic information that they need to understand the world in which they live. This includes factual information: when was World War II, who fought in it? But also, how have conflicts in some cases been avoided? How are negotiations conducted? That kind of peace education is one to which I subscribe. If you define peace education as education in support of unilateral disarmament, I have negative associations to that.

Lennart Vriens (Utrecht, The Netherlands)

I think that peace education is, in essence, good education. I think that peace has to be analyzed just as Galtung did – into "positive peace" and "negative peace" – and I think education is primarily in favour of something and not against something. I define peace education as the kind of education which introduces children into the world in a way that is adjusted to their situation and their possibilities and confronts them with their future responsibilities for preservation of life in this world, inviting them to accept these possibilities and adapt them to their own situation.

Riitta Wahlström (Jyväskylä, Finland)

To me, the basic ideas behind peace education are human rights, equality and justice. People are struggling or striving to acquire human rights all over the world – not only in their own personal life – and to save their environment and their life in general. To me peace education means nearly the same thing as humanistic education: to educate people to honour human

dignity, human rights and justice.

ÅB: How would you as a psychologist describe the traditions of violence? What is it that keeps them alive?

RW: It is important to state that they are *not* the result of some inherent aggressive human nature. However, there are several psychological factors that may be mentioned. For example, there are various elements in the education of boys and in our general culture that foster "militaristic" attitudes. It should be an important task to demonstrate how the picture of the ideal man as aggressive, competitive and power-oriented in the upbringing of boys and young men is a hindrance in the development of a more peaceful world. Propagandistic enemy images and threat images, supported by groups with vested interests in the war industry, may contribute to feelings of insecurity and thus enforce a felt need for a strong defensive posture. A conventional upbringing with a heavy emphasis on respect for authority and obedience can also be seen as an aid in maintaining conditions for war in the sense that obedient soldiers are necessary in order to realize war. Peace education should be designed to counteract these factors that foster insecurity as well as authoritarian and "militaristic" attitudes.

Peace education has often been related to non-violence. Perhaps we cannot learn to love everyone equally, and we might be afraid of groups of people who are strangers to us. However, we *could* learn that violence is the worst way of "solving" problems. And nowadays we have to realize that the violence against the environment is a very dangerous type of violence. – Peace education means both a continuous struggle for a better understanding of those who are different from us, and a struggle against structural violence.

The question of "inner harmony" in peace education has often been mentioned. As far as I understand, inner harmony is an important aspect. At schools or other educational institutions, different methods for meditation or relaxation could be used. But I think that this approach is not enough. A harmonious person might be very nice to his or her friends etc., but not really care for others. That is why I think that the deep moral values, related to an understanding that all humans are basically the same and equal, are more important than our own "inner harmony". The desire to make this world better also for exploited people is important. The challenge of peace education is how to stimulate and develop these values and desires.

Zlmarian Jeanne Walker (Brasilia, Brazil)

I think of so many things. The first I think of is a global perspective and taking positive steps to create a peaceful world; teaching students what these steps might be and giving them some sense of responsibility to take some of those steps. I don't know which ones they want to take, but some of them I hope they will take.
ÅB: So it is not only a kind of knowledge – it's a kind of action you are talking about?
ZW: Yes. A peaceful world is an absolute necessity, and these children at an international school will have special opportunities to work for peace. I also work with teacher training seminars. In many Brazilian cities I have done seminars for teachers in regular public schools: an in-service training on peace education. I have found the response to be incredible; if I was able to, I could work with this all the time.

Christoph Wulf (Berlin, Germany)

It is my opinion that these constellations of conflict are still central matters of concern in peace education. As I see it, peace education includes both the work with a negative peace concept and the efforts to realize a positive peace concept. To this should be added the efforts within society to bring social justice into being. This also involves tolerant socializing with other people in such a way as to respect their own individual differences while avoiding subjecting these differences to one's own frame of reference and interpretation. Seen in this way, peace education is also education for tolerance and acceptance in one's dealings with the other person.

Richard Yarwood (London, England)

I think of peace education as having four parts: recognition that a conflict exists; understanding the cause of the conflict; searching for alternatives, hopefully non-violent solutions to the conflict; and the implementation of those alternatives. If peace and justice are to be achieved, educational forces are crucial to that happening. We have two related expressions: "peace education" and "education for peace". One description of the difference

between the two is that peace education tends to concentrate on content, whereas education for peace more looks at methods. We have produced a little booklet which deals with these two terms.

Nigel Young (Hamilton, New York, USA)

To me it has a very strong meaning, *because I have been* involved with peace education networks and with people who identify themselves with the peace education field for about 20 years. I suppose my reaction to the term now is less positive than it was ten years ago. One of the reasons why it's less positive than it was then is that I think that the task is more to learn about peace than to educate. The problem with the word educate for me is that it has a connotation that we know and therefore we can transmit. I think that we don't know enough, and that most of what we can transmit is questions. We need to know more and research more. So for me the idea of collective learning about peace is a better phrase than peace education. But I do teach peace studies, so you might find some contradiction there.

ÅB: In this peace education or collective learning about peace, would you include more than facts and cognitive aspects? Do you also consider attitudes and values, for example?

NY: Yes, but I would like that we would mutually reflect on values rather than trying to presume that we should inculcate certain values, so it would be a dialogue about values. I would certainly be open to share my concerns about war, nuclear war, violence and justice, but I would anticipate and accept that other people's priorities may be different.

References

Ankarstrand-Lindström, G. & Bjerstedt, Å. (Eds.) *Sex danska och sex svenska röster om undervisning för fred.* /Six Danish and six Swedish voices on education for peace./ Malmö: School of Education, 1988.

Bjerstedt, Å. (Ed.) Fifty peace educators: Self-portraits in passing from twenty-two countries. *Peace Education Reports*, No. 7, 1993.